REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed April 21, 2005. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case in view of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,389,460 issued to Stewart ("*Stewart*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Stewart* does not anticipate independent Claim 1 because *Stewart* does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every claim limitation of independent Claim 1. For example, Claim 1 recites, "comparing the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform ..., the specific transform defining an action to perform on the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion," and "performing the action to combine information from the header portion and the first uniform resource identifier to yield the second uniform resource identifier." Contrary to the Examiner's belief, nowhere in *Stewart* are these limitations disclosed, taught, or suggested. The Examiner merely cites to various locations within *Stewart* to teach the limitations of Claim 1 without explaining his reasoning.

First, the Examiner cites to column 8, lines 46-51; column 9, lines 18-21; and column 9, lines 37-46 of *Stewart* to teach "comparing the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform associated with the first uniform resource identifier, the specific transform defining an action to perform on the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion," as recited in Claim 1. However, these locations in *Stewart* say absolutely nothing about transform criteria or the identification of a specific transform. In fact, nowhere in *Stewart* is the identification of a specific transform based on transform criteria taught or suggested. *Stewart* does describe a slot creation process in which "an image identification string is formed . . . by concatenating the URL, the merged cookies and the authorizations that have been obtained by earlier processing operations of the slot creation processing 500." However, this concatenating is not based on a comparison to any transform criteria to identify a specific transform.

Second, the Examiner cites to column 4, lines 56-66 of *Stewart* to teach "performing the action to combine information from the header portion and the first uniform resource identifier to yield the second uniform resource identifier," as recited in Claim 1. However, although the citation states, "forming an image identification string by combining the URL, the merged cookies and the authorizations," this says nothing about combining information form a header portion with a first uniform resource identifier to yield a second uniform resource identifier. The cookies mentioned in *Stewart* are not equivalent to the header information of Applicants' invention. Cookies are generated by a server and placed on a client machine, while the header information of Applicants' invention is "based on the choices made by a user of a web browser in the 'Preferences' or 'Options' portion of the web browser." (Applicants' Specification, page 8, lines 15-17). A cookie is defined in Stewart as "a state-control mechanism used by the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) to enable an HTTP content server to deliver different content to different client users." (*Stewart*, col. 11, lines 40-42).

Thus, *Stewart* does not teach each and every claim limitation of Claim 1 and, hence, does not anticipate independent Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-10 are also not anticipated by *Stewart* because they include the limitations of independent Claim 1 as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Stewart*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection of these claims be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 11 is allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with Claim 1. Thus, *Stewart* does not anticipate independent Claim 11. In addition, dependent Claims 12-20 are also not anticipated by *Stewart* because they include limitations of independent Claim 11 as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Stewart*. Therefore, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicant believes no fees are due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Thomas A. Beaton
Reg. No. 46,543
PHONE: (214) 953-6464

Date: 6/21/05

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**
Attorney Docket No.: 066241.0111